

GEORGE L. HASSELBACK, ESQ. – (F0325-NMI)
O'Connor Berman Dotts & Banes
Second Floor, Nauru Building
P.O. Box 501969
Saipan, MP 96950
Telephone No. (670) 234-5684
Facsimile No. (670) 234-5683

Attorneys for Plaintiff Lisa S. Black

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS**

1 Plaintiff, by and through counsel and pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 37 and LR 16.2CJ(d)(1),
2 hereby moves this honorable Court for an Order compelling Defendant CNMI Public School
3 System (“PSS”) and Defendant Jim Brewer (“Mr. Brewer”) to properly respond to various
4 discovery requests.¹
5

6

7 First, several of Defendants’ responses to interrogatories refer the reader to other
8 interrogatory answers. *See* Fed.R.Civ.P. 33(b)(1) stating, in relevant part, that “[e]ach
9 interrogatory shall be answered separately and fully in writing.” Also, *see generally Scaife v.*
10 *Boenne*, 191 F.R.D. 590, 594 (N.D.Ind. 2000) stating that an interrogatory answer “should be
11 complete in itself and should not refer . . . to other interrogatories.” Defendants’ should be
12 compelled to resubmit answers to those discovery requests to which they referred to other
13 responses
14

15

16 Again in an attempt to clarify admissibility issues in advance of trial, Plaintiff has asked
17 PSS to identify any objection to admissibility of the over two-thousand (2,000) pages of
18 documents it has produced. Once again, PSS has refused saying this is an overly burdensome
19 request. As explained in Plaintiff’s first Motion to Compel, all Plaintiff wishes to do is dispose
20 of as many preliminary issues as it can before trial. Since these documents were produced by
21 PSS and PSS has admitted to their authenticity (*see* Hasselback Decl.), there is no reason why
22 PSS cannot now identify any objections it may have.
23

24

25 Additionally, both PSS and Mr. Brewer again refuse to answer specific document
26 requests asking them to produce documents that they will use in support of their various factual
27

28¹ In order to meet the two-page limit pursuant to this Court’s local rule, Plaintiff would respectfully direct this Court to the Declaration of George Hasselback filed in support of this motion for a recitation of the various requests and the dates upon which they were served to the Defendants.

1 contentions. As this issue has been briefed in Plaintiff's first Motion to Compel, Plaintiff will
 2 refer the Court to its arguments and authorities in support of them and rest upon the previous
 3 briefings.

5
 6 Furthermore, Mr. Brewer refuses to answer interrogatories and provide documents
 7 relating to his financial net worth. Since Plaintiff has plead facts sufficient to state a claim for
 8 punitive damages, Mr. Brewer's financial status is not only relevant, but discoverable right now.

9 *See Mid. Continent Cabinetry, Inc. v. George Koch Sons, Inc.*, 130 F.R.D. 149, 152
 10 (D.Kan.,1990) (stating that "knowledge of defendant's net worth will be of value to both sides in
 11 making a realistic appraisal of the case, and may lead to settlement and avoid protracted
 12 litigation"). Any privacy concerns can be met because "this interest can be adequately protected
 13 by a protective order." *Id.*

15
 16 Plaintiff made a good faith effort to resolve this discovery dispute before seeking Court's
 17 assistance. *See* Declaration of George Hasselback and Declaration of Michael Dotts, filed
 18 herewith. PSS would not cooperate. Plaintiff therefore, requests that this Court order Defendants
 19 to serve responsive answers to the various discovery requests, and to pay the reasonable costs
 20 and attorney's fees of the Plaintiff for having to bring this Second Motion To Compel.²

21 Dated: July 11, 2006

22 Respectfully submitted,
 23 O'CONNOR BERMAN DOTT & BANES
 24 Attorneys for Plaintiff Lisa Black

25 By: _____/s/ _____
 26 GEORGE L. HASSELBACK (F0325)

27 K:\3000\3221-01 Lisa Black\PL\Draft\3221-01-080706-Memo MOCompel-gh.doc

28 ² See Fed.R.Civ.P. 37(a)(4) stating, in relevant part that "the court **shall**, after affording an opportunity to be heard, require that the party ... whose conduct necessitated the motion . . . to pay to the moving party the reasonable expenses incurred in making the motion, including attorney fees" absent several circumstances not present in this situation.